DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 178 367 SO 011 240

AUTHOR	Wallace, Joan I., Ed.
TITLE	Cultural Pluralism and Citizen Education.
INSTITUTION	Research for Better Schools, Inc., Philadelphia, Pa.
SPONS AGENCY	Hazen Foundation, New Haven, Conn.; Office of Education (DHEW), Washington, D.C.
PUB DATE	78
NOTE	59p.; A Symposium discussion (Washington, D.C., February 10, 1978)
AVAILABLE FROM	Publications Office, Research for Better Schools, Inc., Suite 1700, 1700 Market Street, Philadelphia, PA 19103 ($3.00, paper cover)
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC03 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	Bilingual Education; Changing Attitudes; *Citizenship; Cultural Awareness; *Cultural Pluralism; Curriculum Development; Educational Change; Educational Needs; Educational Objectives; *Educational Programs; Elementary Secondary Education; Higher Education; Racial Attitudes; School Role; Social Change

ABSTRACT

Conference proceedings are presented which explored the relationship of cultural pluralism to citizen education. Discussants included members of federal offices, national organizations, state departments of education, and private foundations from the U.S. Office of Education, the Office of Bilingual Education, the Council of Chief State School Officers, the Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development, and the Council for Educational Development and Research. Three major topics were examined: (1) the implications of ethnic pluralism for citizen education, (2) the school's responsibility for teaching the implications of ethnic pluralism in citizen education programs, and (3) immediate action which schools might take regarding instruction in the implications of ethnic pluralism as an element of citizen education. Discussion of the first topic covered definitions of citizen education, the benefits of bilingual education, and racism as an impediment to social change. Discussion of the second topic cited the need for access to equal educational opportunity, reduction of discrimination, awareness of cultural alternatives, and clarification of students' attitudes and self-concepts. The traditionally Anglocentric emphasis of school curriculum was identified as a barrier to recognizing true cultural pluralism. Discussion of the third topic emphasized the need for changes in social values, curriculum, and teacher education to promote acceptance of all cultural groups. (AV)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED178367

CULTURAL PLURALISM AND CITIZEN EDUCATION

A symposium discussion
on February 10, 1978
in Washington, DC
by
Russell L Adams
Elizabeth Farquhar
Rosa Castro Feinberg
Irving M Levine
Michael Novak

Edited by
Joan D Wallace

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Ulik Rouk

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

Sponsored by
The Edward W Hazen Foundation
The United States Office of Education

The symposium was organized
and carried out by
Research for Better Schools, Inc

Russell A Hill, Director
Ethical-Citizenship Education

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

SP 011 240

Published by
Research for Better Schools, Inc
1700 Market Street
Philadelphia, Pennsylvania 19103

Ethical-Citizenship Education

Director:
Russell A Hill
Editor:
Joan D Wallace

Copyright © Research for Better Schools, Inc, 1978

The opinions expressed in this publication
do not necessarily reflect the position
or policy of the funding agencies,
and no official endorsement by them
should be inferred.

Design: Peter Maxwell

Table of Contents

Overview viii

The Proceedings 1

What Implications Does Ethnic Pluralism Have for Citizen Education? 3

What is the School's Responsibility for Teaching the Implications of Ethnic Pluralism in Citizen Education Programs? 23

What Immediate Action Might Schools Take Regarding Instruction in the Implications of Ethnic Pluralism as an Element of Citizen Education? 41

Closing Comments 48

Appendix 1: Panelists and Participants 49

Appendix 2: Biographical Sketches of Panelists 50

Overview

The current call for effective ethical-citizen education is far from a new rallying cry or "instant slogan." In fact, it is a reiteration of, and a recommitment to, one of the foundations of our democracy: the preparation of a citizenry concerned with our core civic ethics and equipped to take part in civic affairs. This renewed emphasis is reflected in all sectors of our society, from grass-roots communities to the federal Administration and Congressional levels, from leading professionals of many disciplines to a variety of concerned laypersons and lay interests.

Symposia: Ethical-Citizenship Education

This document reports on the second of a series of symposia convened to address key issues surrounding the Ethical-Citizenship Education (ECE) movement —concerns, caveats, recommendations, and potentialities.

The first symposium took place June 16, in Washington, D.C. Three major questions served as a springboard for the discussion:

1. What Are the Core Civic Ethics of American Democracy?
2. What Is the School's Responsibility for Teaching These Core Civic Ethics?
3. What Immediate Action Might the School Take Regarding Instruction in These Core Civic Ethics?

Building on the generally accepted commonalities in civic ethics discovered at the first symposium, the second moved on to examine the relationships among this commonality, cultural pluralism, and citizen education. It was held February 10, 1978, also in Washington, D.C., and addressed the following questions:

1. What Implications Does Ethnic Pluralism Have for Citizen Education?
2. What Is the School's responsibility for Teaching the Implications of Ethnic Pluralism in Citizen Education Programs?
3. What Immediate Actions Might the Schools Take Regarding Instruction in the Implications of Ethnic Pluralism As an Element of Citizen Education?

Panelists at both symposia spoke to an audience limited to Administration, Congressional staff, and educational leaders, who commented at intervals.

The symposia are sponsored by two groups: The Edward W. Hazen Foundation and the U.S. Office of Education, in collaboration with Research for Better Schools.

The Hazen Foundation has for many years supported educational ventures in various aspects of higher education. In recent years it has selected four priority areas: "(1) improvement of educational institutions in order to promote personal growth as well as learning; (2) creation of opportunities for young people to develop and apply insights, skills, and experience toward the solution of contemporary individual and social problems; (3) the encouragement of interest in esthetic, moral, and religious values, particularly as they relate to the achievement of cultural parity among people at local, national, and international levels" *(The Edward W. Hazen Foundation: A Fifty Year Survey and Triennial Report, 1973-1975).* We are grateful for The Hazen Foundation's help in carrying out the symposia as part of a larger overall ECE program (see below).

The U.S. Office of Education, within the past few years, has established a Task Force on Citizen Education. This unit has worked closely with the overall ECE program and contributed both ideas and funds to the symposia.

Research for Better Schools, a Philadelphia-based educational research and development laboratory, contracted to direct the program. The laboratory served as the host group and carried out the symposia plans from conceptualization to execution. The laboratory has designated citizen education as one of its major program components for the next five years.

An Advisory Group, established early during the genesis of the overall ECE program, contributed wit and wisdom to all phases of the symposia events.

We believe the symposia reports should be of interest to a variety of concerns and disciplines, and a source of recommendations and suggested directions of immediate and long-range value to the ECE field. It is our hope that the meetings provide a forum which will stimulate the Administration and Congress to intensify their support of ECE as a priority at all educational levels.

The Overall ECE Program

As stated, the symposia are part of a larger ECE program whose objective is the development of ECE programs and their introduction in schools (public, nonpublic, and parochial) across the nation wishing to undertake such activity.

The following factors give impetus to and underlie past and present ECE efforts:

—There is a growing insistence across the country for the introduction of ECE-like programs in schools. The insistence comes from parents, political leaders, state and local education agencies, educational leaders, religious leaders, and the general public —as evidenced by surveys, public statements, polls, policy statements, and the media.

—There is a growing body of new and promising research and theory directly related to ECE. This knowledge makes possible the development of powerful and valid educational programs that enable students to realize ECE objectives.

—There is a plan for a coordinated program of R, D, and D in the ECE domain which has the endorsement of a wide constituency, including prominent leaders in education, religion, the research community, parent groups, and school practitioners. The plan is based on school-community cooperation and specifically calls for local adaptation of ECE programs according to differing community needs and perceptions.

The ECE program had its genesis in a year-long planning program funded in 1976 by the National Institute of Education. The objective of the planning effort, carried out by Research for Better Schools, was the preparation of planning recommendations for an ECE R, D, and D plan. Major planning accomplishments included:

—Development of documented need and mandate statements;

—Development of an ECE definition which commands broad consensus;

—Development of an advocacy/constituency across educational, religious, and civic publics;

—Collection of judgments/recommendations from ECE experts;

—Collection and analysis of ECE literature;

—Development of cross-communication in the broadly defined ECE field;

—Conceptualization of the ECE research and theory into four major domains of activity; the developmentalists, as represented by Havighurst, Kohlburg, and Piaget; the decision theorists, as represented by Peters, Rawls, and Wilson; the values theorists, as represented by Lasswell, Raths, and Rokeach; and the prosocial researchers, as represented by Bandura, Hoffman, and Staub;

—Formation of an eminent Advisory Group;
—Convocation of a National ECE Conference;
—Publication of a number of reports, papers, and resource documents related to various aspects of ECE;
—Preparation of a coordinated plan for ECE R, D, and D (referred to above) based on the recommendations developed during the planning phase.

The current program emphasis is to present the case for ECE to various audiences. To this end, under the continued leadership of the Advisory Group, a series of symposia (the first of which the publication reports) is being held. The objectives are:
—3To obtain the assistance and support of the educational community and selected public schools for coordination of multilevel ECE efforts;
—To obtain the assistance and support of educational leaders in the Administration and federal government for ECE program development at all levels;
—To explore the possibilities and strategies for developing federal legislation and state leadership to support a variety of ECE efforts;
—To publish and disseminate symposia dialogues and other informational material to foster communication and cooperation among the many persons, groups, and activities in the ECE field.

Support, leadership, and coordination are needed to make ECE a reality.

For further information and documentation, contact:
Russell A Hill
Director, Ethical-Citizenship Education
Research for Better Schools, Inc
1700 Market Street
Philadelphia, Pennsylvania 19103
215-561-4100

Panelists

Russell L Adams	Chairman Department of Afro-American Studies Howard University
Elizabeth Farquhar	Director Task Force on Citizenship Education U.S. Office of Education
Rosa Castro Feinberg	Associate Director General Assistance Center for Bilingual Education University of Miami
Irving M Levine	Director Institute on Pluralism and Group Identity American Jewish Committee
Michael Novak	Professor of Religion Syracuse University Author; Lecturer

THE PROCEEDINGS

Russell A Hill *(Research for Better Schools)*

Good afternoon.

I would like to acknowledge the two funding agencies that have made possible this symposium series: The Edward W. Hazen Foundation and the United States Office of Education. We are grateful to both of them.

Today we have some good news and some bad news. First, the bad news. Governor Apodaca will not be with us due to a legislative crisis; he has sent us his regrets and best wishes. Second, five minutes ago we received a call telling us that Thomas Minter, Deputy Commissioner, United States Office of Education, has been called to the Secretary's Office—and we can't pull priority on that!

Now the good news. In their place we have Rosa Castro Feinberg and Elizabeth Farquhar. We are privileged to have them with us, as you will soon discover.

I now turn over the meeting to our Moderator, Russ Adams.

Russell L Adams *(Moderator)*

Thank you.

I see a number of faces that were gathered here for the first symposium discussion of democratic core civic ethics. I think it fair to say that at that time we agreed that there is a commonality of certain basic civic values in our society. We now arrive at Phase 2, the exploration of ethnic pluralism. Under Phase 2, we see a variation of civic ethics and that variation might be listed under the rubric of pluralism or ethnic pluralism—and its implications for citizen education.

Let me restate the questions we will address today:

1. What implications does ethnic pluralism have for citizen education?

2. What is the school's responsibility for teaching the implications of ethnic pluralism in citizen education programs?

3. What immediate action might schools take regarding instuction in the implications of ethnic pluralism as an element of citizen education?

There are subquestions within these three areas. Under the first major question we might include the following subquestions:

1. How can ethnic pluralism be defined? What are its antitheses?

2. What is the basis for the claim that ethnic pluralism is an imperative concern? On what authority?

3. How does/should ethnic pluralism relate to citizen education?

For the past decade there has been a renaissance, a revival of interest in the cultural diversity that has always been around. At one time we attempted to say that the cultural variety did not exist, that we were all simply Americans, that the population · hyphenations—Italian-American, Afro-American, for instance—were not necessary. Yet any good politician knew (and knows) that cities encompass a variety of groups—whether we call them ethnic groups, subgroups, or whatever—as attested to by the time-honored "balanced ticket." Today our panelists explore how the implications of ethnic pluralism can be dealt with educationally, what can be done to convert difficulties and differences into constructive dividends, how diversity can be used in a positive way by those of us engaged in education.

We will tackle the three major questions one by one. The speakers will each have five minutes to respond to each question and then we will have discussion from the floor.

Will you start us off, Dr. Feinberg?

WHAT IMPLICATIONS DOES ETHNIC PLURALISM HAVE FOR CITIZEN EDUCATION?

Rosa Castro Feinberg *(Panelist)*

I'm sorry that I cannot discuss the view from the Governor's Mansion, but I do think I bring a perspective which is often missing at policy-level conferences. My perspective is that of the "little red schoolhouse," at least the little red schoolhouse that you see in Regions III and IV, as interpreted by a Spanish-American woman.

The implications of ethnic pluralism for citizen education is kind of a big title to swallow all at once. I would like to break down citizen education along the lines indicated by statements made at the preceding symposium. The kinds of things I mean by citizen education include areas that we may have known by other names —for example, civics, citizenship, consumer education, moral education, values clarification, literacy; not only reading and writing skills but scientific literacy, consumer literacy and, yes, ethnicity literacy; human relations kinds of activities; and career education.

What does cultural pluralism have to do with all these things that we abbreviate in "citizen education"? Ethnicity refers to groups of people with distinctive cultural characteristics, chief among those characteristics being language, and already I am on track to talk about bilingual education! The problem is that bilingual education, like citizen education, includes many kinds of things. Before the meeting someone mentioned the recent *Time* magazine article on the Miami bilingual experience. My response is that it appears to be half an article; they must have run out of pages, for it doesn't give a clear picture at all of what is happening. I want here to explain how bilingual education in several of its specified forms fits into citizen education, with particular emphasis on its relation to ethnicity.

If you view the areas that I enumerated —civics, consumer education, career education, and so forth— as abbreviations of goal statements, as goals held for groups of people from different ethnicities, with different cultural and different language characteristics, the question then becomes: How do we get many separate ethnic groups, and students from those groups, to reach the goals represented under the rubric of citizen education?

Let's talk about three specific kinds of students: linguistic minority students who don't speak English, linguistic minority students who do speak English, and English-speaking majority students. My point here is to indicate how bilingual education can lead students from these three groups toward the goals of citizen education.

Of the non-English-speaking minority students —let's say the Cuban students, the Puerto Rican students, the Chicano students, the native American students who do not presently speak English— bilingual education is, first of all, a requirement for gaining equal access to education, assuring a meaningful participation in school activity and avoiding academic retardation while the English language is being learned. It is a bare minimum. The base level of possibility incorporated in the term citizen education can only be approached through a form of bilingual education which provides access to the English language and which also provides subject-area instruction in the student's native language.

What do English-speaking minority students (like myself in the first grade) have to gain from bilingual education as a vehicle leading toward the goals of citizen education? For one thing, a way for the students to stay in touch with the heritage of their families, the traditions of their communities; a way to achieve a continuity —notice I didn't say maintenance, but a continuity— of language and instruction, a continuity of cultural information, and a source of self-pride based on knowledge about their heritage. It permits students to capitalize on the advantages of their particular ethnicity and to contribute their ethnic talents to the larger society. In my case, for example, there was no Spanish instruction offered in the elementary school I attended in New York City, and I avoided that instruction at the secondary level in Miami because I already knew how to say "Holh, Isabel." As a result, I didn't learn to read and write in Spanish until I began to teach Spanish as a foreign language, and I was always barely one page ahead of the students! I would have been a much more effective teacher if I had not had to delay my own "bilingual" education.

I have run out of time, but there is, of course, an important category of the minority student who speaks English: the black student. I am sorry that Dr. Minter is not here because he was part of a Wilmington coalition of blacks and Hispanics working together in the interest of equal educational opportunity for both black and Hispanic students. The insights derived from that experience, and an account of the contribution that bilingual programs made to both sets of minority students, would have been, I think, of compelling interest to us here.

Finally, for the majority student who speaks English, involvement in bilingual education programs carries with it the

opportunity of enrichment from insights into another language and culture, the opportunity to contrast value systems, the opportunity to examine cultural alternatives, the opportunity to enrich her/his career development —among other benefits.

A last word about our responsibility to meet the requirements of the Helsinki Accord. In a traditional foreign language program, students have 40 minutes' exposure to language, let's say three, four, or even five times a week, and a limited opportunity to use that language because they know nobody in the community who speaks it. In a bilingual education program, which includes linguistic majority and linguistic minority students, they have both the opportunity to interact with each other and the opportunity to understand, in a way otherwise impossible, the other's language and culture. The implications of that kind of understanding for effective citizen participation in an increasingly interdependent world are well worth considering.

Russell L. Adams *(Moderator)*

Thank you for an interesting introduction to, and in some ways a definition of, pluralism as it relates to the crucial linguistic-bilingual element.

We are now ready to hear from Mr. Levine. I hope that he will further expand our definition of cultural pluralism as reflected in the kinds of concerns that he and his organization have.

Irving M. Levine *(Panelist)*

Speaking for my own people, we cannot survive in any society that is not culturally pluralistic; so we have a major self-interest in promoting cultural pluralism. When I say "survive," I mean literally physical survival related to life or death, and I mean death continuously, in society after society. So it is fair to say that the American Jewish Committee and the Jewish community are heavily interested in a life-and-death way in the whole concept of what I call the "new" pluralism in American society, which goes beyond race, which encompasses the entire society.

I want to make another statement that I hope you will challenge if you wish. There is no way, no way at all, that this country can achieve its most important domestic and international imperatives unless it has a conceptual pluralistic umbrella. Almost every major failure we have had domestically and internationally relates back to how culturally incompetent we are.

We are an amazing nation of highly repressed people about our own reality, at home and in the world. We are repressed about pluralism. The Institute on Pluralism [American Jewish Committee] carries out a lot of studies, psychological as well as studies in the field of sociology and political science. I think we have learned why the repression exists. I am going to try to explain it because we are never going to grasp the problem or deal with it unless we understand why a small piece of legislation like the Ethnic Studies Act, with a 1½ million dollars appropriation, is shunted aside and fiddled with each year as if it were a disastrous threat to the nation; and understand why anything related to race, ethnicity, or language is not only debated endlessly but eventually frittered away. Historically, this has been the case. We have recycled the issue every 25 years and we have not resolved it.

Let us look at the "why." Racism, of course, is an answer, a major answer, but there are other answers too. In our new pamphlet, *Race, Ethnicity, and Human Development* it is stated that ethnic identity is basic group identity. Anything that is basic, we Americans are going to be ambivalent and confused about. If you are sophisticated about how terrible it is to be ambivalent about sexuality, and you are sophisticated about how terrible it is to be ambivalent about death, then let's all get sophisticated about how terrible it is to be ambivalent about ethnicity and race and pluralism —because we are. We have got to come to grips with this, because pluralism does create a lot of fear in our guts at the same time that we contemplate possible enjoyment from establishing ethnic identity, seeking our roots.

Where there is this kind of ambivalence, there must be education. I think there is an educational imperative for education focused on cultural pluralism. It should be an important priority in this country in terms of social need. I don't mean to paint a gloomy picture. We *are* making progress, but only because people are fighting: chiefly, minority groups, and lately white ethnics, Jews, and others.

Yet we still don't know how to give adequate support to the *Roots* phenomenon; we don't jump in fast enough to reinforce some of the marvelous possibilities that have recently emerged. We have studied what happened right after *Roots* to white consciousness about blacks. While I won't say it was transformed, we did learn something about the surprising positive identification of whites with the family struggle and with the generational struggle of the blacks as depicted in the TV presentation. So we now know that if you want white people to identify with black people, you don't get them to identify on vague, abstract issues which we all profess to believe in; you get them to identify with the very things that they, themselves, are identified with —their family problems,

their generational struggles, their relationships to extended networks. Then you have developed some sympatico, some identification across ethnic lines, across racial lines.

All of this should have a tremendous impact on school curriculum and organization with regard to citizen education or civics education or ethical-citizenship education —all these words I like, they are good words. Cultural pluralism is also a good term; we like that term, but we don't really take it seriously; it still operates on the margin of society rather than defining its basic nature.

Look, you don't have to be told that this is a pluralistically diverse society. You are a perfect example of it as you sit here and look at each other and at me. But you should know more about the extent and importance of this pluralism. Our studies indicate that today in 1978 (when, according to all the earlier experts on American assimilation, we would be well on our way towards homogenization), when you take into account the cumulative impact of a sizable new immigration and you add all the minority and white ethnic groups that proclaim their need for diversity, well over 100 million Americans are heavily into their ethnicity, some more overtly than others, but all deeply affected by their ethnic status. The figure 100 million may astonish you because we all thought that the process of generation had weakened ethnic bonds —and it has— but one of the things that we know about ethnicity is that it is often recycled by new forces which strengthen group solidarity. The idea has long been disproved that this society would move in a straight line from strong immigrant feeling to a certain kind of (Michael Novak coined the term) "plasticized Americanism." Straight line assimilation has been thrown off course not only by domestic struggles for equality and for group identity but by foreign affairs issues that relate to Africa, the Middle East, the struggle for human rights in the Soviet bloc, the industrialization of South America, the language struggle in Canada, and so forth. These events around the world touch off all kinds of feelings of pride and ambivalence among diverse groups in the U.S.A.

I don't see how we can carry on a foreign policy, an intelligent foreign policy, without considering the ethnic nature of Eastern Europe, of the Soviet Empire and its links to the United States, of the various Eastern Europeans here. I don't see how we can carry on a Middle East policy without understanding the nature of what is happening in America ethnically to Jews and Arabs. I don't think we can deal with Africa. How can we deal with South America? We have an emerging Hispanic culture in this society that is of wide scope. There are now 2 million Hispanics in New York City alone, and only 1 million are Puerto Ricans (a group we used to use as a measure of Hispanic influence). Overnight we have practically 20

million Hispanics in this society, even though the official figure may be 15 million; 25 million blacks; 6 million Jews; 8 to 14 million Poles (depending on whether you believe the Census or well-informed scholars). I say 8 to 14 million Poles because the Census, too, is ambivalent and doesn't really want to count ethnics beyond the first and second generations. It is very difficult to be able to get an accurate fix on the ethnic factor in our population. This adds to its underestimation as a vital force. According to Italian-American experts, there are almost 20 million Italian-Americans. The Irish are declining as a political force in many cities; there are only 250,000 Irish in New York City, but you still hear them and you always will! And so on down the list.

These groups have differential achievement, differential family patterns, and differential structures. In particular, they have differential coping mechanisms which they have acclimated themselves to over centuries. Yet we have developed policy that rarely meshes with these cultural patterns. In the last 20 years of related social engineering, the outstanding problem has been the incongruence of policy with contemporary ethnic life-style. In short, we have been culturally incompetent and consequently we have had many unnecessary failures.

How can we continue in such ignorance, spending billions of dollars and not delivering anything nearly like what we want to deliver? We can do so only if we have either consciously or unconsciously decided to be ignorant. Therefore I have no question about the imperative of cultural pluralism in education, nor do I think that it is too complex to teach about ethnic identity and also about the common culture together. Difficult, yes; challenging pedagogically; but we have developed all kinds of curriculum, some very good; we have developed competency in many complex areas of learning; and we have the people themselves who, if put in touch with their own roots, can deal with this educational imperative. Let's also understand that in this country there is such a thing as WASP pluralism as well: The rural Georgian and the Boston Brahmin are both WASPS, but there are obvious differences.

I think we also need to agree among ourselves that this is not just a question of education. It is a question of the basic organization of this society, and this includes some of the most difficult controversial problems we face. Education should be dealing with them, and we have most of the tools to do it. But what we *don't* have is the *will* to do it. We are intimidated by criticism; we are frightened that if we deal honestly with ethnicity, we will be responsible for the fragmentation of society —as if the lack of honesty around ethnicity is not already a major reason for our present fragmentation.

We must understand a basic principle: Fragmentation of

society comes from the *lack* of recognition of differences, not the reverse. People pull away when the common culture does not give note and attention to their real needs —they fragment to assert their particular agendas. But, contrarily, when the common culture begins to accept their diversity, the coalesce with other groups around broad economic and civic interests.

Russell L. Adams *(Moderator)*

Let me ask Elizabeth Farquhar to respond to our first question.

Elizabeth Farquhar *(Panelist)*

Thank you. This is an interesting assignment for me, particularly because, as Dr. Minter's substitute, I only heard about it a few minutes ago!

I think it might be useful to look at citizen education, explore what that means, take a look at cultural pluralism, explore what that means, and then see how the two might or might not intersect.

Citizen education means different things to different people. For the purposes of our staff [U.S. Office of Education Task Force on Citizenship Education] we came up with some elements which we think are central to the concept. One of them has to do with identification with one's community, community in a very broad sense —it could be one's local community, or ethnic group, or state, or country, or the world.

Another element of citizen education relates to developing competencies which will enable people to participate in public life and have an impact on civic decision-making. This comes closer to the more traditional notions of civics and government but with an increasing emphasis on *active* involvement.

Another dimension has to do with an understanding of the rights and responsibilities of individual membership in group context, and these contexts can vary. This is not learned exclusively in a government situation. You can also talk about family membership, you can talk about community, you can talk about ethnic groups within communities facing common problems.

Finally, citizen education has something to do with learning about the kinds of values which underlie our and other systems of government.

Now let's consider cultural pluralism. Cultural pluralism has to do with the belief that cultural diversity is an asset to American culture, something to be strengthened and en-

couraged—the kinds of things Irving Levine was talking about. It is that complicated notion of unity with diversity, a notion which frightens many people because they are not quite sure it is possible. Is a society possible, they wonder, in which everyone is secure in his or her own identity and willing to extend similar rights and respect to others? Cultural pluralism connotes a fundamental commitment to the principle of individual worth and dignity. It rejects both assimilation and separatism as ultimate goals, and supports the development of interaction among the diverse groups which make up our society.

I believe that cultural pluralism also includes ideas that conflict. Tension and change are characteristics of culture; they are inevitable, and in a pluralistic society one learns to deal with them instead of learning to fear them by avoidance.

In practice, the history of citizen education has always been concerned with the reality of cultural diversity in American society, and traditionally the role of the school in socializing a nation of immigrants was to inculcate American values and loyalties. The basis was an Anglo conformity model founded on such values as achievement and appropriate participation or understanding of Anglo-Saxon institutions. When a new influx of immigrants in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries threatened what was considered to be the existing civic values, citizen education focused even more sharply on Americanization, inculcating to excess the idea that the practices of Anglo-Saxon institutions were superior to those of the immigrants' native land. Implicit in this inculcation process was the notion that immigrants must abandon their own values, which were considered to be inferior.

As for nonimmigrant minority groups —blacks, American Indians, and Mexicans— for them, difference was a deficit that couldn't be repaired and citizenship was not even considered potentially available to them.

In the twentieth century a slightly liberalized version of Americanization appeared: the "melting pot." The "melting pot" postulated that all of the groups that made up American society would somehow melt, meld, and create a new person, but this person turned out to be once again the Anglo-American.

In order to look in a slightly different way at how cultural pluralism and citizen education do or do not match, I did a quick analysis of the core civic ethics which were discussed at the last symposium. The kinds of things brought up, included, for instance, equal access to life's opportunities, equal justice under the law, respect for individual dignity and worth, equality, and liberty. It seems to me that those kinds of values intersect the philosophy of cultural pluralism, and they are also a basis for many of the activities of ethnic groups. So I see here a perfect match between the objectives of teaching

about citizenship and the objectives of cultural pluralism.

Let me give three examples of this linkage. First, the notion of civility, respect for the values and views of others —again, multicultural education emphasizes learning to understand that people have different experiences, that they see things from different points of view.

Second, competition of ideas – I think that those concerned with ethnic identity feel that ethnicity is a source of rich variation in beliefs, ideas, practices, life-styles, and so on.

Finally, the notion of community, the sense of human connectedness. I think that this is perhaps the most critical problem for both citizen education and cultural pluralism. Ethnic groups place great value on community and neighborhood —they always have. Indeed, the ethnic group is a place where that feeling of community was fostered. Ethnics banded together by choice (but also by denial) and nurtured their communities and institutions. However, in many instances this resulted in ethnic enclaves which had little interest in developing linkages to other ethnic groups. I think this is the fragmentation problem which Mr. Levine rightly calls a source of fear.

Russell L. Adams *(Moderator)*

Last on this question, but not least, Mr. Novak.

Michael Novak *(Panelist)*

While a three-hour lunch is considered quite civilized in Southern Europe, a five-minute comment on this question is inhuman! It is impossible to say all the things I would like to say in that time.

Let me stress one note: the newness of what we are doing. It is true there are parallels in the past, but I see, and will try to define, a new era not only in the United States but in the world as a whole. For the world as a whole is discovering its cultural pluralism. Nobody lives on an island any longer, separate from everybody else. We all know there are others out there and that our destinies are interlinked. Everyone in the world is aware that we live on a culturally pluralistic planet, and everybody knows that we need a new concept, a new system of education, of course, and many other new systems as well, to prepare us for that fact. We are not here talking about cultural pluralism as a value; first we are talking about it as simply a fact.

We are talking about the dream of a new liberal civilization. Immanuel Kant wrote the fundamental essay, "What is Enlightenment?" usually cited as the single most important

document of liberal civilization —a concentrated statement. He argued that an enlightened civilization is based (1) on the belief in the universality of human reason and (2) on the significance of the individual. I don't think any enlightened person can believe that now. We have discovered the rest of the world, and the forms of reason used in the various cultures of the world are not the forms of reason used by Immanuel Kant.

There can be a liberal civilization, though, based on commitment to intelligence if we recognize the varieties of ways in which intelligence actually operates. The same applies to the significance of the individual. You cannot believe today that emphasis on the individual alone is the solitary or even the best form of liberal thought. Today, the centralizing State in every part of the world is becoming so strong that if there are only great States and naked individuals, the individuals are going to be wiped out. The only protection individuals have is through the mediating institutions that they can build to stand against the State —the family, the voluntary association, the educational community, the labor union, the church, the fraternal organization— all those social institutions which are intermediate between the individual and the State. The Constitution of the United States is silent about these institutions and speaks only in terms of the individual and the State. But the individual and the State are not appropriate categories for discussing the realities of the late twentieth century. Hence we are talking about a new era, a new liberalism; we are talking about a new ethnicity.

Many students of international affairs recognize that the most powerful force in the world today is ethnicity, including the desire for cultural autonomy. I could cite hundreds of instances in every part of the world in which the creative and also the destructive energies of people are deeply tied into their longing to be themselves, to resist what might be called the "Coca-colonization" of the world.

It is exactly because technology has made the world so much one that people feel free to try to be themselves. Furthermore, the "new" modern and "enlightened" man shaped by technology has proven to be unattractive —too often a Watergate type, a moral cipher. No wonder people everywhere are rebelling and going back to human traditions that are in some ways better than those of modernity. Modernity has taught many good values, but modernity is not enough.

This, I think, was the significance of *Roots*. It is no accident that the National Book Award winners in the last three years have all been books of this sort: *World of Our Fathers, Passage to Ararat, Roots* itself. Then there is the much-cited book by Richard Gambino, *Blood of My Blood*, and so forth. The same holds true all around the world —there are movements of

national liberation, movements for cultural autonomy. Most creative people are looking for connections to their own history, for humanistic reasons.

What are the implications, then, for citizen education? Education for the real world must be eudcation in cultural pluralism. And education for the United States must be education in cultural pluralism, since that is what we share. We do not come, those of us who sit at this table, from the same type of family or the same kind of history, and we haven't each had the same kind of experience with politics. Therefore, we differ about our notion of what a citizen is. We probably differentially practice voting. We hear a different ring to the word "morality." I know, speaking as a Catholic, that when I hear a politician say "moral," my stomach turns. I know he is out to get me. I don't know how but I can feel it coming, because when the politicians say "Reform," Catholics are always the first to be singled out for reform, even if we only play bingo!

So, we all have different histories about key words like "moral." How can you teach morality and not know that every child in front of you has a different history in the family, has heard different tones in such words? I would like to imagine a kind of future in which we develop an education to make us more aware of the fact that human beings live in cultures, that they carry thousands of years of cultural tradition and mores with them, that you can't trample those things without doing them an injustice.

One last point. To emphasize cultural pluralism is not necessarily to emphasize group life. The individual is the carrier of culture, and in an interesting way. You don't have to live in an enclave or go only to meetings of your own group. That is impossible in a pluralisitc society like ours. We don't want to live apart from one another, by no means! Nevertheless, we continue to want to nourish a different sort of literature, a different sort of values, a different memory of grandparents. Russ Adams's great-grandparents or grandparents might have been slaves; mine were serfs, but they had no civil rights. My great-grandfather's brother's leg was cut off with a scythe for stealing a chicken.

When I went to school it was understood that in order to be an educated person you must know at least two languages—providing that the second language you studied at school was *not* part of your ethnic heritage and was never spoken at home! There was no opportunity to learn Czech or Slovak or Ukrainian or Lithuanian, which constituted 70% of the languages of Johnstown, Pennsylvania.

And now my children, the next generation, also going to school, learn nothing about the history of Central Europe, nothing about the part of the world their families came from. I don't say they should live in an ethnic enclave; not in the least.

I just wish there were a little bit of material available for them and others, because this nation's dealings with great social forces in Eastern Europe affect all of us.

Russell L. Adams *(Moderator)*

We have gone the round on the first question. Now we will take questions from the floor for a five- or ten-minute period and then move on to the second round.

George F. Lowe *(U.S. Office of Education)*

Every time I hear Irving Levine or read something that Mr. Novak has written, I come to the question: Why is it, though, when you start dealing with educators and politicians, that somehow there is something faintly un-American about what Levine is saying, about what Novak is saying, and even about what is happening in Miami? That *Time* magazine article that Dr. Feinberg mentioned is scurrilous. Why this overtone of un-Americanism?

Irving M. Levine *(Panelist)*

Because when something has been suppressed for one reason or another, buried, and it suddenly emerges, it usually emerges in an uncomfortable way as part of a social movement or protest movement. It can be disruptive; it can look quirky; it can violate the conventional wisdom people have gotten used to; and it can be threatening.

It shouldn't be difficult for us to understand that. We are all frightened by the unfamiliar. And the approach we are discussing is unfamiliar because, as I have said, we have suppressed the desire for liberation from the oppressiveness of conventional society. While this is not an argument against conventional society, there is a feeling that in order to make our way in society, we have to "down" our emotion, flatten it out, live a certain kind of twilight existence between what happens at home and what happens in polite society. So cultural renaissances, especially of peoples, shake us up.

We have had a good 20 years of social movements, one after the other, all of which have had a group-identity label. As a result, more people respond by saying, "My God, groups are getting out of hand, what next?" So, pluralism is threatening and it is frightening, although, interestingly, when it gets stabilized people live with it very well. The way whites have begun to live reasonably well with middle-class blacks —I say,

reasonably well— is fascinating to somebody like myself who entered the civil rights movement 25 years ago, when reasonable discourse between the two races was thought to be impossible.

Rosa Castro Feinberg *(Panelist)*

Another part of the problem is that the "man on the street" does not identify with his own ethnic group. It is like language and dialect. A person will say, "Oh, he speaks such-and-such a dialect but I speak proper English." Obviously, no one speaks a language, everyone speaks a dialect; moreover, everyone speaks an idiolect of a dialect. In the same way, everyone has ethnicity, but because of the impact of the schooling experience, not everyone recognizes it. Thus the man in the street is left in the position of saying, "I'm an American. I don't have any of these ethnic trappings and problems and considerations. I don't have to be bothered with all of that. Furthermore, I don't get rewarded for ethnicity because I don't have any. Now affirmative action and special fellowships and this and the other have come along and I don't get any of that either."

The source of this attitude lies with the kind of education we have provided in the past, and the remedy lies in the kind of education we provide in the future.

Russell L. Adams *(Moderator)*

I am glad to see the conversation moving to the question of pluralistic conflict related to social values and benefits —what is to be competed for and who is to get what. We moved toward this area when we talked about our psychological shakiness and ambivalence concerning pluralism. I would also like to go beyond the psychological aspect and hear more about our society's structural impediments to (as well as constructive forces for) ethnic pluralism, for it is in the structural arena that a lot of the action takes place, where funding agencies look —group impact, affirmative action, and so on. Enough of editorializing.

M. Bruce Haslam *(National Institute of Education)*

The question Dr. Lowe asked was a specific one: Why do politicians and educators sometimes view ethnic pluralism as being un-American? It seems to me the answer is simple: Because it *is* un-American.

I would like to raise some issues regarding Mr. Levine's comments. He talked about cultural-political imperatives of this country. Cultural pluralism may get in the way of, interfere with, national gearing up for technological developments. For instance, I am wondering what would have happened to cultural pluralism in the late 1950s. I think it would have gotten in the way of the kind of standardization that was then going on. Therefore, I repeat, given what politicians are about, given what educators are about, pluralism *is* un-American, and we may thus fundamentally disagree about national priorities and imperatives.

I believe we do need to look at ways of developing citizen education pluralism programs, but I also think that one serious structural impediment is, in fact, our possible differences in the definition of national imperatives.

Irving M Levine *(Panelist)*

Oh, indeed. The question really is: Do groups have a right to contend about this, to strive for their definition of what a national imperative is? Or does one select groups that consider themselves sufficiently wise and competent to take on the task of defining imperatives for our society as a whole?

I think it is very American for groups to contend, don't you?

M. Bruce Haslam *(National Institute of Education)*

Yes, I do indeed.

Irving M Levine *(Panelist)*

Then, why would you say that a society focused on technological development is automatically a society which cannot accommodate certain kinds of pluralistic contention? What about contention concerning spiritual issues arising from religion? What about contention that comes from an ethical or ecological approach to life that is less concerned with the kind of technological imperatives you talk about? Don't you think these things ought to contend in the arena of public opinion and policy-making?

M. Bruce Haslam *(National Institute of Education)*

If you are asking whether I think they ought to, the answer is yes, I do think they ought to. But what I am saying is—

Irving M Levine *(Panelist)*

How do you think the contention would interfere? I have to ask you this question because in using the word "interfering," you seem to be trying to tell me that we have been tremendously successful over the past 25 years with the technological model. I see nothing but massive failure. We have sunk to a society which is now celebrating punk rock —that is, decadence.

Ellen Griffin *(U.S. Office of Education)*

Can anyone think of a quick example of a technological model which might be deterred somewhat because of cultural pluralism? What, precisely, are we talking about?

Russell L Adams *(Moderator)*

I wonder if the question isn't really: What is the relationship between the pressures for conformity and the pressures for pluralistic preservation?

M. Bruce Haslam *(National Institute of Education)*

Sure.

Russell L Adams *(Moderator)*

And how can you arrange for groups to have sufficient sense of genuine pluralism to enable them to defend themselves against conformity when they want to?

M. Bruce Haslam *(National Institute of Education)*

Precisely. The history of the development of technology in the last 25 years is also the history of the standardization of cultural forms, and I am not saying that is a good thing. I am saying that it is a very important factor of civilization, so when you ask me "ought," I would say yes, I agree it ought; but if you look at other patterns, particularly in the political domain, then you have a different definition of reality. That is all I am asking for.

Michael Novak *(Panelist)*

Thirty seconds on the first point. I imagine that it is exactly technological development which has allowed the dialectic between universalism and particularism to swing to the other side. Now we have greater freedom to become particular without any danger. In other words, when you have a society that might easily be fragmented, everybody puts energy into unity. One has to do everything possible for unity because other energies tend the opposite way. I think that this is a fair picture of the period prior to 1950.

After the 1950s you find a climate of sameness, like, for instance, every college cafeteria in the country appearing to serve up food obviously made somewhere in a kitchen underneath the State of Nebraska and moved via conveyor belts everywhere else. Food is the same everywhere you go, and because you can't tolerate the sameness, and because there are so many forces moving you towards homogenization, you begin now to freely look for more variety. This is no threat. It is not a necessary threat to civilization to seek and find variety. So I think the reverse of your [Haslam's] point is true —that technology has, in fact, *liberated* the new ethnicity. That is why I call it *new*. It is not tribal any longer; it is new and it is liberated by technology.

My second point: You have to remember that while we are talking about something new and still up ahead, we are at the same time dealing with politicians who were formed by the experience of the preceding generation. Most of the Congressmen and -women I know from Southern or Eastern European backgrounds got elected because they were the first ones to come out of their ethnic community and try to represent everybody in the district; they spent their whole careers showing that they weren't ethnic. In fact, there is a form of what is called in ecumenical circles "ecumania," a condition which leads you to think that every church is good but your own. The same thing applies here —politicians can do favors for every ethnic group but their own.

The bureaucrats are a bit different. The most powerful culture in this country was willing to share economic power, providing it held on tightly to the cultural institutions. One had to follow their style in order to come near leadership roles in the culture, and even then the leadership in the cultural institutions was carefully controlled.

David Gurr *(ACTION)*

Most of us get together generally for one of two reasons, in our discussions and in our society —either because we

are intellectually curious about the others and feel secure enough to come out of our own ethnic, racial, or whatever corner and explore what other people are like; or because we need to decide how to spend scarce resources. Technology hasn't increased our resources enough; it has probably had a reverse effect, limiting resources, in a way.

In the second Lindsay election in New York City the New York *Times* said, "The only undecided group in New York City are the middle-class Jews." Their decision at the polls, stated the paper, would depend on whether they thought Lindsay had done too much or not enough for black residents of New York City. That is what the election got down to; that's pretty bad, and that's where we are.

Michael Novak *(Panelist)*

But that was deliberate on Mayor Lindsay's part. It was a tactic, a tactic which has been used, if I may be permitted a political observation, chiefly by candidates of the Left. They have chosen to make race the cutting issue of their campaign because they wanted to make an alliance between, in the case of New York, the blacks and Hispanics and upper-class Liberals, and they didn't care if they ran roughshod over the traditional alliances of the Left.

Thus politicians deliberately make racial-cultural issues divisive for their own gain, and I think the only way to defeat that is to call the game by its name and to show people that they are being *used* as cultural groups, willy-nilly, and that they might as well awaken to it and themselves develop the politics of coalition. Similarity of interests among working-class whites and blacks far outweigh their cultural differences, and you can build coalitions around that fact if you are intelligent. I think we simply must become more intelligent in our techniques to prevent our being used.

Jerry Fletcher *(Assistant Secretary for Education's Office)*

I want to make an observation. I haven't heard in any of our discussions here a vision of what a pluralistic society is or might be. I can't get hold of it yet. My brother is an anthropologist and I once asked for his observations of this culture. He said, "Well, probably the most unique thing about the United States, both historically and internationally, is the amount of diversity of religion that it has tolerated consistently for literally hundreds of years." Is that the kind of image you have of a culturally pluralistic society—essentially a circumstance in which each ethnic group, however defined,

could flourish to the fullest degree it wished, and presumably anybody could choose which kind of ethnic group he or she wanted to identify with? Or do you have some other sense of it. In the sense I describe, the citizenship notions are akin to the kind of training I got about respecting the right of other people to embrace whatever religious belief they choose; this right is written into the Constitution, the government cannot interfere, so we have left it there. Is that the kind of image of society you have, or are we trying to work toward some other image?

Russell L. Adams *(Moderator)*

Does anyone want to respond? Dr. Feinberg?

Rosa Castro Feinberg *(Panelist)*

I think that we have a culturally pluralistic society right now. It is not something that is going to happen. The question is: Is the society structured in such a fashion that pluralism works in some instances for and in some instances against the interests of a person holding a given ethnicity? In other words, is there an imperfect mechanism operating in the presently existing pluralistic society? Ideally, certainly in relationship to the school, your ethnicity should not bar you from any of the opportunities that school or society might offer. Further, your ethnicity should be a valued resource for you in whatever direction you care to use it. It should be exploitable for your own purposes.

Elizabeth Farquhar *(Panelist)*

It seems to me we are talking about a positive regard for the notion of cultural pluralism. I agree it is a fact that we deal with, that we see around us every day. Yet within that fact George Lowe can remark, "It sounds un-American," and people will nod because it does. That means, to me at least, that something is wrong in terms of the legitimacy of the notion of ethnic pluralism.

Michael Novak *(Panelist)*

May I say a word? Religion is my field of work and it needs to be said, I think, that religion and ethnicity are very close to one another. One reason for the variety in America is that people brought with them different cultures and different heritages. Though on certain grounds you would predict that these heritages would perish long ago, this has not been the case. The

differences—cultural and religious—are cherished and closely intertwined.

In education, though our heads are turned in such a way that we don't learn who the American people are. The major political journalists of this city recently had to scramble to find out what a Southern Baptist is. How can you grow up in the United States of America and not know what a Southern Baptist is. But the fact is that the most educated people didn't know because that is one of the "no-no's" in the studies of dominant institutions. "Southern Baptists are odd, strange people out there who will get over it," the enlightened seemed to think. But when it comes to being enlightened, being enlightened from what? Being a Southern Baptist is one of the things you are enlightened *from*, and the same is true of kids from Catholic neighborhoods, and the rest of it. Diversity suffers.

We educate ourselves to a false consciousness, and this bias is deep in our guts. It is amazing how little we know about ourselves and others in our society. Our practice is better than our theory and better than our education. It thus becomes a matter of getting our education up to the level of the real achievements of this country.

Russell L. Adams *(Moderator)*

I think what is being said is that ethnicity also has some ethnocentricity in it, in turn causing some sort of analytical myopia. To summarize some of the comments generally, I think we are also saying that the enlightenment Novak mentions should not be left to chance, because it won't happen automatically. We need to be very self-conscious about learning about others *independent* of what that knowledge will be used for. Subsequently, of course, there must be some notion about what this knowledge will be used for and some orchestration of the power of ethnic groups to reach a particular goal.

One other thing. It may be worth speculating over the question of the relationship between religious practices and power. I think we have separated the two over time. We don't know what a Baptist is because to our minds this denomination does not represent power in terms of either the group or its members. It may be in terms of some other things, perhaps in terms of citizen education.

Michael Novak *(Panelist)*

We know a lot more about Baptist culture —now that it is powerful. We are also learning a lot more about Arab cultures— now that they are powerful.

Russell L. Adams *(Moderator)*

One final comment, and then we will move to our second general question.

Wilson Anderson *(U.S. Office of Education)*

Maybe my question is premature and will be covered in the remaining two topics to be considered, but I am still not sure that we have satisfactorily addressed the reconciliation of ethnic or cultural pluralism with national interests. (I think the question of guarding against ethnic and cultural myopia in the context of national goals and interests has been squarely addressed.) I think we should be concerned with the danger of an ethnic or cultural conservatism working against such ideals as, say, equal access or equal opportunity or equal whatever.

One final observation: We should be aware that those here today, talking to each other and agreeing, are not really the obstacle to the kind of reform that needs to take place in the schools. It is the state legislatures that determine what shall be taught in the schools.

Russell L. Adams *(Moderator)*

A very well-taken comment. Not speaking for the Washington group and not speaking defensively, one premise behind this gathering is to reaffirm for many of us our concerns and visions of what could be. A second premise is to use that reaffirmation as a trickle-down (or -up) kind of process, creating an ambiance for the follow-through at other levels and for ultimate dissemination. In that sense we here may be the right persons in the right place; but the other part of the sequence must be the follow-through. Hence today's invitations amount to, in one sense, a balanced ticket for the next level of dissemination.

Let us move to the second question, which gets to the dissemination issue:

What is the school's responsibility for teaching the implications of ethnic pluralism in citizen education programs?

The subquestions:

1. What has been the school's responsibility in this regard in the past?

2. What are the current points of difference concerning roles of the school in this area?

3. Is it possible for the school to be neutral with regard to teaching, directly or indirectly, the implications of this ethnic pluralism?

WHAT IS THE SCHOOL'S RESPONSIBILITY FOR TEACHING THE IMPLICATIONS OF ETHNIC PLURALISM IN CITIZEN EDUCATION PROGRAMS?

Joseph Kerns *(Teachers Corps)*

Maybe this will tie in with Mr. Anderson's comment about discussion among those already convinced. It seems to me that if I were a parent, I would be very nervous listening to this group today because I would have had too much experience of the teacher becoming a preacher. We have always said that the American public school system is supposed to be neutral, and "values" is a bad word, and so on, and yet the average person knows better. The whole reason for a parochial school system, for a foreign-language school system, for the Orthodox Jewish school, and so on, is that the founders feel their values will be threatened by what the child is going to hear in public school.

Russell L. Adams *(Moderator)*

Could we come back to you after the panelists discuss the second question? They will, I hope, address some of your concerns. Rosa, your turn.

Rosa Castro Feinberg *(Panelist)*

I am glad Mr. Kerns made at least the beginning of his comments. It ties into a remark Dr. Adams made regarding the possibility of neutrality in schools. I want to pick up on that point, mention three very general kinds of observations once over lightly, and then posit a listing of what I feel are the obligations of the school.

Let me pick up on the neutrality of the school. Without preaching, without talking, without writing it in the rules, without putting it in policy, the school communicates the "values" message. Sometimes it is referred to as the weight of bureaucracy, sometimes as the invisible culture, sometimes as the hidden curriculum, sometimes as the hidden agenda, but

whatever you call it, children get a message from the school they go to. Sometimes the message to the student is that you are valued; sometimes the message is that you are not. Sometimes the message is that you are going to do well; sometimes the message is that you will never do well.

It is not, I am sure, a deliberate attempt by people with malice to thwart the educational progess of the child. Rather, it is the inevitable outcome of cultures clashing with cultures, without insight and without the provision of training for the people running the schools in that situation. I am going to ask you to keep the idea of the hidden curriculum in the back of your mind.

Let me jump to a book that was very popular maybe 10 years ago, and maybe it still is, *The Saber-Toothed Curriculum*. The whole idea was that a course in the care and feeding of dinosaurs might have been relevant socially when there were dinosaurs about, but when they left, as they did some time ago, that particular course was not necessarily appropriate to the curriculum of most children. I am making an analogy to the kinds of curriculum that we find in school and the kinds of society that the schools are supposed to equip the students for. Often there is little relationship between the two, and the cutting part, the hurting part, about that lack of relationship is that you are preparing students to deal with a hypothetical "model American," who, as we know, does not exist. You are not preparing children to deal with the vast diversity of persons and cultures and languages that we know does exist—even inside the school, although sometimes rather covered up.

Bilingual-bicultural education is one means whereby the school can deliver instruction to children that will lead them to the goals of what we are calling citizen education. Please keep that in mind while I share with you a listing of school responsibilities drawn primarily from work James Bank has done. I will make a comment or two to refer it back to the panelists' comments, but in each case please say to yourself: Can bilingual bicultural education do this? I hope you will nod your head "yes," and then in each case ask yourself a second question: For which group of students can bilingual-bicultural education be effective, the lingusitic minority non-English speaker, the lingusitic minority English speaker, or the English-speaking majority student? You will help me get a little more mileage out of my five minutes if you will do that.

Here are some of the things I think the school is obliged to do in terms of meeting its citizen education objectives when dealing with a culturally and ethnically diverse student population.

First, and most fundamental, to provide access to equal

educational opportunity. That is codified in our laws, mandated by our legislators, urged upon us every day. It is a real and compelling area where attention needs to be directed.

Second, to act to reduce discrimination against stigmatized groups. The specific stigmatized group will obviously vary from area to area. I work in a region where less than six years ago one could go into a little town's restaurant and pass a sign saying, "No dogs or Indians permitted." Needless to say, there is a nearby Indian reservation which sends students to the school. Out of every 40 Indian students a year, perhaps 2 eventually graduate. A case in point of discrimination against stigmatized groups.

Third, to present students with the notion of cultural alternatives—the idea that there are many possible ways of being, many of them acceptable in different areas of society and some of them, of course, acceptable in all areas of society; the idea that the negative effect of the standardization of a technological, industrial society on a person can be ameliorated in a number of ways, many of which have to do with one's ethnic clime.

Fourth, to reduce ethnic isolation, both physical and psychological.

Fifth, to help students develop ethnic literacy, including such things as doing what you can as a schoolperson to diminish credence in ethnic stereotypes, doing what you can as a schoolperson to develop curriculum which accurately reflects contributions of various ethnic groups to our overall society.

Sixth, to help students clarify their attitudes toward members of ethnic groups other than their own and, perhaps even more important, to help them clarify their attitudes toward their own ethnic group.

Seventh, to help students learn how to act to eliminate racism and predjudice in whatever society or subpart of that society they find themselves.

Eighth (and this relates to the questions about national interest, I think), to help all students develop a positive self-concept, with all of the implications and all of the interrelationships that hold for their ethnic-group membership.

Ninth, the school has an obligation to learn to draw upon the resources of parent groups and community groups in meeting all the obligations that I have just listed.

Russell L. Adams *(Moderator)*

Mr. Levine, do you want to address this question?

Irving M Levine *(Panelist)*

I wanted to touch on not just the responsibilities of the schools but also those of society in general, perhaps answering Dr. Anderson's comment on ethnic myopia. There is also such a thing as ethnic prophecy, and I think we ought to teach it. The black movement of the 40s, 50s, and 60s was ethnic prophecy, and some of its great figures were prophets in our nation and should be recognized as such. They established justice where there was none —or they tried to establish justice. There is no finer lesson for American democracy than these ethnically oriented struggles for equality, and there are live, touchable bodies in today's classroom that personify that drive and that struggle. There is no better lesson plan than one developed right out of the experiences of the kids in the classroom. So, I don't see that recent ethnic struggles represent ethnic myopia, though many people see them as special pleading for group interests. I always felt that special group interests legitimately set the American agenda and were often ahead of their time in representing the needs of all people for dignity, equality, and identity.

The struggle of the American Indian not only for land but for an appreciation of ecological values has been a complicated one for our society but will turn out to be precious and necessary—I call this ethnic prophecy, not ethnic myopia. The survival of the Jews out of the holocaust, and the establishment of the State of Israel, represent the redemption of a people —I call this ethnic prophecy, not ethnic myopia. There are so many other examples. The struggle of working-class ethnic Americans of East European background who sacrificed to build up this country in some of the slimiest jobs there were, often taking satisfaction from a good day's work —the whole concept of work and family and fidelity and marriage and children which they brought to American society —I call this ethnic prophecy, not ethnic myopia.

I don't see this kind of ethnic advocacy as in contradiction with core American values. I see these struggles as the making of core American values and changing them when they fell short. There is negative ethnic chauvinism, of course, but there is a marketplace where other ethnic groups and other group interests also assert themselves, and in this marketplace any extremism will, in my opinion, eventually be taken care of. There *are* ethnic wars, to be sure —the whole of United States history is a history of struggles, fierce struggles, of ethnic succession. You should read the real history behind the tales from the early nineteenth century, all the things that came down to us as American legends

and ended up as the "cattlemen versus the farmer." They were ethnic struggles. They were not defined just that way, but that's what they were. Religious denominational struggles were often ethnic struggles, and they sometimes looked like they would shake the world, and sometimes they did, but they were largely resolved by time.

Affirmative action today —and we ought to teach it in this context— is nothing more than the force of an ethnic group or a number of combined ethnic groups trying to change the rules of society so that they can establish justice. Are they right? Is their quest for equal opportunity right? Yes. Do I agree with everything they want? No. Will the force of contention be eventually moderated by the courts and the legislature? Yes. Will we strike some grand compromise somewhere along the line where indivduals in previously advantaged groups will not lose too much and groups that need to gain will gain more than they have in the past? Yes, if we understand the phenomenon of American pluralism, if we don't panic because somebody wants to speak the Spanish language in a classroom. It's astonishing that many people who send their little children to French bilingual schools are terrified of, traumatized by, Hispanics trying to deal more effectively with a tremendous acculturation problem. It is unbelievable how it incites and frightens us.

I think you can teach effectively about pluralism. I think children see conflict all around them. I think any kind of curriculum should deal with group conflict, the history of group conflict and the glories of the resolution of those conflicts as well. I think it can be taught from the backgrounds of the various children in the classroom, their parents and their grandparents; and I would bring the parents and grandparents into the classroom, so that ethnicity and family roots are made more vivid.

You can't get a better classroom program than a black grandma, a Jewish grandpa, and a Polish grandma listening to the children say, "Grandma, Grandpa, tell us what it was like the first day you got off the boat or the bus, and tell us about your first job." It is fantastic, first of all, what happens around the room in terms of grandparents coming together around common things and liking each other because they recognize their common struggle and the triumph of being alive and the joy of passing on their wisdom to their grandchildren. There is no question that it is powerful. You don't get delinquent acting-out in the classroom when this program is happening, especially when the kids bring in their own grandparents. The children are quiet and respectful, as they should be; and it is good education.

Russell L. Adams *(Moderator)*

An issue we have not yet addressed is that of ranking these pluralistic groups. I think this has been in the back of some of the questions here. We have had an egalitarian vision of pluralisms. I thought of this point especially when Levine talked about the grandpas and grandmas coming to class. We have tried that, and sometimes it works beautifully and other times it does not. Maybe some commentary today would help us learn how to accentuate the positives of these kinds of encounters and reduce the negatives. Elizabeth?

Elizabeth Farquhar *(Panelist)*

Addressing the first subquestion: "What has been the school's responsibility in the past?" it seems to me that whatever that responsibility should have been, the fact has been a response of evasion; of saying, "It doesn't exist for me"; of fear. We don't talk about ethnicity in the classroom because it might create some disturbances, because feelings have intensified since the 60s when racial and group strife became a dramatic problem in the United States.

I think teaching has vacillated between an unrealistic, unappealing do-good emphasis —we are all wonderful human beings, we all have many things in common, support the United Nations— and an emphasis on difference —highlighting the exotic costumes of elderly immigrants once a year, that kind of thing. Neither makes much sense when you are talking about what I think is a real concern of educators: how people feel about themselves and others, how to build bridges between groups, and among groups. It seems to me that these are things for which the schools need to take a very direct responsibility. We are talking about the societal curriculum, about things which exist in the real world and which kids learn about all the time.

I think that to teach ethnic studies by emphasizing, for instance, one ethnic group plus a fictionalized mainstream group can perhaps bring about some myopia, some overconcentration on a few specific ethnic groups. It seems to me that there has to be developed in education a genuine sense of what intercultural education is. And this sense needs to underlie our talking about my group or yours, or even our talking about the fact that I may belong to several groups and what impact that has.

Schools have a further responsibility to help develop respect for one's own identity and to develop a sense of confidence, particularly within the citizenship curriculum.

How does a child who comes out of, let's say, a poor neighborhood and a minority ethnic group, whose parents aren't well educated, whose ethnic group has historically lacked political power, and who consequently doesn't know much about the way government works —how does that child gain the confidence and skills which will then enable him or her to become an effective citizen within our society?

I think, finally, schools have a responsibility for developing the students' capacity to interact with people who represent different cultural points of view, to understand what it is to have a perspective that is different from their own. These kinds of things will later enable students to negotiate, to compromise on issues if necessary, to function as effective citizens in a pluralistic society.

Russell L. Adams *(Moderator)*

You have a little time left. I would like, if you will, to have you comment on the possible connection between the recent study that your office [U.S. Office of Education Task Force on Citizenship Education] is pulling together with regard to citizen education knowledge we need to convey about the structure and processes of government, and the possible parallel needs, in some people's view, in the area of ethnic education and pluralism. Is there a connection between the need to stress the structure of government and its practices on one hand, and the reality of the varieties of people who make up the society in which that government operates on the other hand? What about that combination?

Elizabeth Farquhar *(Panelist)*

We certainly see ethnic studies as being part of the whole area of citizen education, and I think other people feel that way also. A recent assessment of the citizenship knowledge, attitude, and competence of children in this country, carried out by the National Assessment of Educational Progress, shows an appalling decline since 1969, particularly in students' knowledge of the structure and function of government. I haven't really looked at the intricacies of the results, but I do know that the results are lower for children who come from less well-educated parents; they are certainly lower for blacks than they are for whites; and so on. That would be one area where there is an interaction.

Russell L. Adams *(Moderator)*

We move now to Dr. Novak.

Michael Novak *(Panelist)*

It is clear from the proceedings so far that we are talking about something new. Otherwise, there wouldn't be quite so many fears expressed. In fact, it is clear we are dealing with something so new that it is on the borderline of repression —deeply repressed material of which we are afraid— and it is odd that we well-educated people should be afraid of a subject. We could probably say anything in the world about sex, and it wouldn't scare anybody here. But we start mentioning ethnicity and everybody gets nervous —like the Victorian Age's nervousness about sex.

Let's try to guess why this is so. In the past our schools' curriculum was quite ethnocentric. What was basically taught was the English-speaking person's view of the world (though the schools pretended they taught the humanities). All of history was seen from the point of view of the British Isles southward, along with people with whom the British had difficulties, for instance, references to the Spanish Armada. We learned almost nothing about others with whom we share the hemisphere —it was as if they didn't exist. Why? I think you have to say it is the deep influence of the British culture. There has been an antagonism between the Spanish-speaking world and the English-speaking world now for three or four centuries, and we are still acting it out in the American school system.

Moreover, when you study philosophy at major universities, you basically study Anglo-Saxon thinkers. Saxony is in Germany, and you read German philosophy; Hamlet was a Dane, and there is a touch of the Scandinavian; and you read some Italians and Greeks if they are very long dead. However, I don't see how one can disagree, if one reflects back on one's own education, that we received an Anglocentric view of the world, even if we, ourselves, are not Anglo-Saxon. I'm not Anglo-Saxon. God knows I am delighted to have been brought into this culture, which is one of the world's most free cultures, but it isn't the whole of the world.

The Anglocentric view was appropriate, perhaps, until the Second World War, after which time the United States became an international power, the world's single most powerful culture, economically and technologically. Our interests reached everywhere. My father studied nothing at all in school about Iwo Jima and other places that were to figure prominently in the history of his generation; and my broth-

ers and I studied nothing at all in school about Vietnam, which was to figure dominantly over the 10-year period of our coming of age as adults; and God knows what is happening somewhere else in this world today that our children haven't studied about that is going to affect their destiny. People in the United States cannot afford to be so ignorant of the world in this period in history.

The odd thing about President Carter's lacking an accurate Polish translator is that it is estimated that 1 out of every 10 Americans has at least one grandparent from Eastern Europe, Christian or Jewish or unchurched. You would think that somewhere in that vast pool there would be lots of people who know exceilent Polish, who go back and forth between America and Poland every year, who are in touch with the best Polish philosophy, the best politics, the best poetry, and so forth. You would think that this heritage would feed into our school system, so that the Slavic world, the Eastern European world, would be well known in America. And the same should be true of the African world, since virtually 1 out of 10 Americans is black. And similarly the Hispanic world, since 1 out of 10 Americans is Hispanic.

You would think that people in the United States would have the best humanistic education on the planet, that they would really learn the humanities —but we don't. I think that this kind of humanistic education is the school's responsibility, and I believe the school must make a connection between the actual people in America, the children in the classroom, and the rest of the world. When I learned that my son and daughter were to have some multicultural work in grammar school, I was pleased. But they came home with materials from Mexico —and there was not a single Mexican-American in the school; from Japan —and there was not a single Japanese student in the school; and from a couple of other unrepresented cultures.

I thought the rule must be to choose cultures identified with no one in the classroom. Yet in this way they teach something false and do not embarrass anybody by falsity. They couldn't talk about real ethnic things in the classroom, for instance, that Jewish kids have different holidays, that Catholic kids have different backgrounds, that the families of some of the Protestant kids on Long Island go 'way back before the Revolution. They never talked about the real emotional issues in their family background even though such things are obviously significant in the politics of the town. You have to be blind to think these things don't affect citizen behavior in the town, but you never dare talk about them.

Some strange fear is the source of the repression. It seems an odd form of education to hide your face from what is real. We surely are adult enough in this day and age to talk about these

things without embarrassment.

I think the responsibility of the schools, then, is to teach reality, American cultural reality, the reality of a multicultural world. And the better job you can do at that in this generation, the better for the future of the world.

Russell L. Adams *(Moderator)*

We have been around the panel on this question. I think we have generally made the point that a *de facto* Anglocentric agenda in the schools has shaped the curriculum, although it is not made explicit by a superintendent or a classroom teacher. If we are moving in the direction of consciously addressing pluralistic education in schools, what about the issue of neutrality (or lack of it) of school systems in doing so? This also relates to an earlier comment [Kerns]. A general discussion is now in order.

Fred Bergerson *(Office of Congressman Frank Thompson)*

I had an experience in California which suggested that government cannot be neutral. The Early Childhood Education Multicultural Program of our school, where I served on the parents' committee, originally stressed ethnic groups that were represented in the schools, though perhaps there were only one or two kids of a particular group —Estonians, Koreans, and so forth. When the state evaluators arrived, they suggested that this approach was unrealistic in preparing the students for the real world, and therefore deficient; that the program should instead stress the Spanish-Americans and black Americans who were in the immediate Los Angeles environs and who had a big impact on the city.

It seems to me that, again, here is the repression. One reason we may repress this kind of thing is because it will lead to conflicts over policy.

Karen Dawson *(U.S. Office of Education)*

Not to be the devil's advocate but to illustrate a couple of problems that I think we must be aware of, one aspect of education that we both hear about and read about a great deal in recent years is curriculum overload. Many people here say that education should do more to bring in materials and resources that point up the identities and ethnic roots of various groups. I think to many teachers that means: "Oh, no, they want

me to do more —find more materials, perhaps teach another course."

I think in the late 60s and early 70s overload became manifested in courses such as black studies, women's studies, Jewish studies, especially in higher education and at the high school level. Much of the traditional curriculum had gone by the wayside.

Another problem that has not been addressed is the values question, the potential values incongruence between the school and the home. I think many parents of an ethnic group whose lives are apart from that group, don't want their children exposed to their heritage in school —again, the other side of the coin. They want their children to be successful and they see success as getting the "American" tools and skills to allow them to work into the mainstream society, not as turning to their heritage or background.

I suggest that there are certain values in society in a much broader sense that we also have to be concerned with. Teacher training, in a basic way, can foster the kind of awareness that we are referring to, helping children to accept themselves and be more accepting of others. The teacher can bring in examples from many different minority and ethnic groups and address pluralistic concerns in this way without necessarily setting it up as a new curriculum or a new study. Another noncurricular approach would be to creatively and inventively use the resources of a community, bringing in people who represent and live different life-styles.

We need creative solutions to some basic problems rather than simply talking about new curriculm.

Barbara Z Presseisen *(Research for Better Schools)*

I want to pick up on what Karen [Dawson] said. I think we are really getting to the nitty-gritty of what the symposium is about. There is a real question concerning teacher preparedness to deal with multicultural education. Teachers are just as narrow in terms of their experience as many of the students. I want to go back to the use of the words "liberal" and "humanities." I think they are at the crux of what we want to get out of cultural pluralism. You don't want an idiosyncratic review of your heritage. What you want is a greater sense of what humanity is about and what being human is about. That is one of the built-in anomalies of this kind of topic. Most of the people who emigrated to this country did so because they wanted to leave their native culture for some reason. I think the emphasis should be on what, humanly, they were striving for, not just collecting odd facts about places in Central Europe or Africa, geography terms, or something of that sort. Rather, the emphasis must be on the human need.

Irving M Levine (Panelist)

Why do you dichotomize between human and ethnic? Do you think that in order to be human you have to drop your heritage? Let's go the other way. Are you saying that if you emphasize your heritage, you will be less human? If so, you are not listening to what we have said.

Barbara Z Presseisen (Research for Better Schools)

I'm not getting it across. I think that what we should be striving to find in our ethnicity is that which is human.

Irving M Levine (Panelist)

Ethnicity *is* human, not "that which is." People are concrete. They come from a place, they have parents, they have a culture. The culture intermixes with other cultures. That is exactly what we are talking about.

Barbara Z Presseisen (Research for Better Schools)

And that is exactly what we have to get into the classroom.

Irving M Levine (Panelist)

Exactly.

Barbara Z Presseisen (Research for Better Schools)

I hear the danger and I approach it negatively. You do want to be careful in focusing on the culture of a student whose parents want her or him to somewhat lose that heritage. Education's task is to "find" it in a positive way; to be unembarrassed by it in the classroom; and to study it for reasons that are human, not just to cover the menu of different kinds of ethnicity.

Irving M Levine (Panelist)

You are talking about the efficacy of pedagogy. Every single question that you have raised —and they are all important

questions— is being dealt with by people who build into curriculum factors to take care of them. We are talking about this as though we invented cultural pluralism and intergroup-relations learning today. We go back 40 or 50 years in the schools in dealing with this. What I mean to say is, no matter how much we seem to have built at an earlier period —we built in 1945, we built in 1955, we built in 1965— multi-ethnic education is still not properly established as the norm.

We have had all kinds of training programs for teachers in inter-group relations; a fortune has been spent by the feds and the states to do this. We have all kinds of curricula — multiethnic curricula, ethnic-heritage curricula, humanistic curricula, history curricula, arts curricula. Any way you want to take it, depending upon your bias about how to organize it, we have those curricula well organized today.

You must recognize what is happening around here. You must recognize that there is tremendous resistance to even look at what we already have. Why this resistance? Why do you dichotomize? Why do you find it so difficult to think in a more complex fashion?

We have to tackle the problem of resistance to multiethnic education on a psychological as well as on a pedagogical level. Look at this discussion —you will find it replicated everywhere on the issue of cultural pluralism. Yours are real and honest questions. The conversation almost has to brought to a confrontational stage to show the depth of emotion. Could you honestly say that my child would be damaged if an intelligent history teacher asked that child, along with all kinds of other generic assignments on the Civil War, "Why don't you take a look and see what the role of the Jews was during the Civil War? You might find it interesting."? What is wrong with an assignment like that? As a parent interested in providing my child with knowledge of his Jewish heritage, I would consider this a distinct plus from a school system.

Barbara Z Presseisen *(Research for Better Schools)*

Nothing at all.

Russell L Adams *(Moderator)*

Let's let some others throw some light on the action. Mrs. Farquhar has been trying to get the floor, and we will then work around the room.

Elizabeth Farquhar *(Panelist)*

I want to briefly address the curriculum-overload problem that Karen Dawson raised, because it is one that concerns me also. A number of people working in the area of ethnic studies have dealt with the problem rather effectively, but let me add some points.

There are many elements in citizen education, for example, government and history, economics, law and issues of societal complexity —cultural, global, technological. I think we need to start thinking about the concepts, the skills, and the pedagogical methods which the various elements have in common.

Let's take something like perspective-taking. This is tied up with the notion of being able to put yourself in someone else's head and feelings, having empathy for someone else, understanding another point of view. Role-playing is one technique used to develop perspective-taking ability; teachers in law-related education use it; teachers in futures use it; teachers in global-perspective education use it; and teachers in ethnic studies use it.

There are numerous topics which are common to both ethnic studies and citizenship education. For instance, consider a course in government —you can deal with the impact of ethnic groups on politics, say, the Irish on local city politics or the influence of blacks, Chicanos, and Indians on the politics of participation. If you are looking at law, at equal protection under the law, you can look at voting rights, at slavery. These are all ethnic issues and they are also issues for citizenship. I would like to see educators begin to identify common themes and teaching methods. Then we could start to put the curriculum back together and cut down on what is a somewhat senseless competition for pieces of school time in an era of shrinking resources. This is an enormous task, involving publishers, teacher, adminstrators, and curriculum planners. But I think we must begin to tackle it.

Joseph Kerns *(Teachers Corps)*

I think if we are to be practical, we must deal with two real problems. The first is teacher suspicion and cynicism. To the classroom teacher, ethnic is now "in." It vies with basic skills and a few other popular areas now.

The very real curriculum problem can be dealt with. It is far more urgent to get across to the teachers, even during their training, what I guess you could sum up in a saying by Ralph Waldo Emerson: "What you are speaks so loudly that I can't hear what you say." Multiculturalism is a fact. That fact is either

good or bad, and every teacher is going to have an attitude toward it. That attitude has some value attached to it, and the teacher had better realize that children are going to sense that value. The teacher's attitude thus becmes one of the most important factors in the whole equation. Teachers must be shown the ground rules for them in this pluralistic society. It seems to me that the teacher knows right away that we are not really willing to face up to multiethnic education.

Indeed, the very existence of school systems, and the constant amalgamation of public school systems, especially in the large cities, are due to the power structure's fear of all these little neighborhood school systems. If the school system were really serious about accepting pluralistic cultures, they would allow the neighborhood, if it wanted to, to revert to its own schools. What is so threatening, why is there such immediate resistance to any group that wants to start its own system of schools? Is it really that much of a threat to the nation?

The teacher knows very well that those in charge, educational administrators, are often like the people who say, "Yes, you use the subway, meanwhile, I have a Lincoln to drive me to work and I may even have a chauffeur with a backup car because I am so important to the country." What we are discussing here can't be put on the shoulders of the teachers. The administration has to do it.

A final point: Parents are going to be suspicious, and with good reason. They are suspicious of the teacher as a preacher. Do teachers in the United States really see themselves as colleagues of parents, or do they regard themselves as somehow superior to parents? Am I your associate or am I from Olympus and delivering to you the wisdom of the world? We are dealing with problems that are a lot more serious than just our immediate issue, but we have to look at them because if we don't, we are going to have tokenism all along the line.

Russell L. Adams *(Moderator)*

Is there any commentary from the panelists before we go to the next question?

Michael Novak *(Panelist)*

I think all your [Kern's] points and all the various fears and worries about possible consequences, or even about methods, are well taken. In other words, as soon as you start to teach something, you get all sorts of questions —possible effects on the parent, possible effects on the child how the teacher is

going to handle the available material. All those are real and important questions.

Once you see the importance of doing something in this area, you can think of it as a long-term project. You don't have to do everything overnight. You can try out a few things. For instance, you can, without introducing any new curricular material, just try consciously to choose examples and illustrations that "touch ground." I think there is nothing worse than an education that covers all the ground without ever touching it. If every once in a while you touch ground with something that the students can recognize from their own lives, it validates the material.

You can talk about the family. If you choose your examples from a family style that no one in the class is living, "the family" (as a concept) becomes foreign to them; whereas if you use an example similar to the lifestyle of their family, they smile. They know what you mean. So, without adding any new material, you have already accomplished a great deal. Going one step at a time, in 10 years we could be in a far better position than we now are.

George E Lowe *(U.S. Office of Education)*

First, to return to the school being neutral —it never has been. The problem then is to understand what it has been instead of neutral.

Second, if we want to do something like letting many cultures bloom, remember what happened to Mao Tse-tung's attempt to let many flowers bloom. That is why I raised the initial question of this whole movement being sensed as un-American. Unless we find what the constraints are and why multiethnic awareness is so severely repressed, we will never affect teacher education, will never affect school boards, will never affect politicians. And the brave teacher who gets cut down as soon as she tries to role-play, to work with the new social studies, the new social science techniques, will find the task almost impossible. She or he can't do it in Prince George's County; it is against the law.

David Gurr *(ACTION)*

I really like Mr. Novack's idea that you can't take the kids to the community, so take the community to the kids —the real community in which they live. That is a good way of learning. Constraints seem to take the form of finances and the attitudes that go along with it.

How far does one go with multilingual-multicultural education? In one of my previous incarnations I worked with Child Development Centers in New York City. The question was: Do we allow public monies to go to a day-care center run by the Hasidim where boys and girls are kept in separate classrooms, and even Hispanic and black children are separated by sex; or, should we allow a day-care center that serves only black children to teach Swahili as a second language? The question always becomes: Where does some dominant culture's values system, whatever that may be, override individual self-expression?

Roosevelt Ratliff *(Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development)*

Apparently, two hot topics in education today are the "back to basics" movement and also competency-based testing. I would like to hear about the relationship of ethnic pluralism and citizen education versus these other movements, which seem to be gaining in momentum.

Russell L. Adams *(Moderator)*

The question is: What is the relationship of the assessment problem to the pluralistic concern and the civic education concern in terms of priorities of attention and time? Does anyone want to give an impression? O.K., Dr. Feinberg.

Rosa Castro Feinberg *(Panelist)*

Let me be specific by referring to the situation in Florida, where we have recently passed an Accountability Act. That Act calls for all eleventh-grade students to take a state-mandated functional literacy and basic skills test. Students have three shots at that test. If they don't pass, they will get a certificate of attendance, *not* a diploma. Do you have any doubt about which kind of students will receive which kind of pieces of paper?

Now, in Florida and in some other states that have similar law or similar law underway, there have been some attempts to ferret out the implications, the specific implications, of that kind of law for the kind of students that we are concerned about—in my case, linguistic minority students— and we are rather primitive in our response. We have only gotten so far as to say that the specific curriculum materials addressing the criteria upon which the test is based need to be developed in

languages that the children have access to —once again, still talking about linguistic minority students, students who don't speak English.

There are some other kinds of things that can be done in the sense of adapting existing materials to make them useful for students who don't speak English. That is how the priorities shape up in my part of the country. The conclusion I draw is that you are not going to get anything like an enlightened citizenry as long as you are requiring students to meet standards, while not providing the resources to the school system to do that job.

Carleen Reck *(National Catholic Education Association)*

I would like to underline the question: Is it possible to be neutral? I think we often are trying so hard to be neutral that we avoid the real issue and, therefore, say it is not important or back away so far that we are actually hostile.

I see the same problem with this clarification of values. If all we do is clarify values, I don't know if there is enough worth in doing it to even pursue the issue of how to do it in a curriculum. We don't ask what is your present knowledge of math, and stay there; or, what are your attitudes about social studies, and stay there. If we accept that schools should be teaching diversity as a positive value, then I would like to go beyond just clarifying present values and look at teaching in this area as a positive dimension. If we can't do that, then let's forget overloading of the curriculum.

Russell L. Adams *(Moderator)*

Actually we have been moving into the last question for the last 15 or 20 minutes. That question is:

What immediate actions might schools take regarding instruction in the implications of ethnic pluralism as an element of citizen education?

The subquestions:

1. What problems and issues immediately confront our society that are related to ethnic pluralism?
2. What are the significant impediments to school efforts to teach the implications of ethnic pluralism?
3. What are the vitalities and forces that may influence the schools to be more active in teaching the implications of ethnic pluralism?
4. What shape might these future efforts take?

Do you want to start us again, Dr. Feinberg?

WHAT IMMEDIATE ACTION MIGHT THE SCHOOLS TAKE REGARDING INSTRUCTION IN THE IMPLICATIONS OF ETHNIC PLURALISM AS AN ELEMENT OF CITIZEN EDUCATION?

Rosa Castro Feinberg *(Panelist)*

I will be happy to. I am going to abandon what I had planned to share with you at this point, except to note that schools should take steps, school districts should take steps, and perhaps you in Washington could suggest steps that Congress might take—to move this field forward.

Now I want to turn to some of the unresolved issues from the last comments. One issue has to do with teacher preparedness, an overloaded curriculum, and bifurcation of the teacher. I want to tie that in with a comment (made, I believe, by Mr. Levine) that there presently exist all kinds of curricula, all kinds of teacher-training programs, and all kinds of audiovisual support for the kinds of educational programs we are discussing.

Now, of all times, is the moment to bring them out, because the teachers presently in the schools are going to be there for the next 10 to 20 years. Possibly we will gain some new teachers because of affirmative-action requirements, but in the main the teachers will remain constant. This means that training programs on a national scale will have a chance to take root and become effective in a way that perhaps has not been possible in the past.

The question is: Does anybody want to implement those kinds of training programs so that teachers can begin to take part in the endeavors we are talking about? Here again I am going back to the terms that come up time and again: resistance, repression, the will to proceed, un-Americanism.

If my understanding is correct, at the time of World War II a whole spate of national character studies came out, several of them under the direction of Margaret Mead. One dealt with Americanism and its relationship to our troops being sent overseas. Let's say we were sending Italian-American soldiers to Italy. No one worried that the Italian-American soldiers were going to socialize with their blood brothers or cousins or uncles, who were the enemy at the time. No one worried

because we almost believed that Americanism was an act of will, an act of good character, and that if you or your father or your mother or your grandmother had the foresight and the moral integrity to come to this country to begin with, then, by virtue of that very fact, you were a better kind of person than your ethnic counterparts in any other part of the world. Nobody would have said it quite that way, but that, according to Mead and her students, was the underlying assumption held in common at that time.

Let me go to another World War II story. For some reason related to the war (I don't remember what), it was very important that people start eating margarine instead of butter. But nobody had eaten oleo and nobody was about to eat oleo. Lewin laid out a series of steps designed to motivate people, to give them the will to shift to oleo, and he was successful. Now, if you can change something so basic, something so fundamental, something so normally unalterable as the kind of food someone is going to eat, then I say that we have sufficient technological know-how to take steps to appropriately recognize cultural pluralism.

What is the goal of those steps? To be at a place where we will no longer say, "I'm O.K. and and you're O.K., and my ethnicity is O.K. and yours is O.K." "O.K." is what I say when somebody steps on my toe; the person has transgressed but I am not going to exact a penalty. What we will be saying instead, in direct relationship to ethnicity, is "I'm terrific and you're terrific," and that's where we want to end up.

Russell L Adams *(Moderator)*

A nice peroration, that. Levine.

Irving M Levine *(Panelist)*

Over the last 10 years I have worked heavily on this topic. This symposium is a good meeting in terms of the issues raised and the feelings expressed. That brings us right back to what you have to do in the schools. You cannot really deal with this effectively unless you establish some conceptual clarity for cultural pluralism. There has to be training for this conceptual clarity.

In addition, there has to be training of top educational administration down through the hierarchy to teachers. The training process must allow people in the training sessions to deal with their own group identity. People really have to be clearly and sharply in touch with who they are. You are not going to be able to deal with this objectively unless you, yourself, have gone through a process of coming to terms with who

you are. Confusions and ambivalences and assertions about where you come from and how you feel about that and how you feel about others —it's all part of the process.

When I say "conceptual clarity," I have to go back to the questions about the conflict between the "dominant culture" and what would probably be called the "subcultures." First, we have to change our language, quite seriously. Instead of a "dominant culture," I like the notion of a "common core culture." Would you allow me to say "common core culture" rather than "dominant culture" and then accept the fact that in a variety of ethnic cultures, you really have threads, strong threads, that make up the common core culture?

The common culture is not simply the consensus. The consensus of the common culture was formed by the threads from the subcultures. That is how we form a common culture, so we can trace these things like constitutionalism, individual rights, collective security —the wide variety of things we need in order to maintain a nation. We can trace them to the subcultures if we want to, and we can trace them to the Judeo-Christian tradition and other religious traditions if we want to, if we want to make the effort.

So, we have to stop thinking in terms of dominance and subservience. It won't do. People don't want to be put in that position any more. They won't have it, and they shouldn't have it. I am being assertive about this because I think our language and our feelings that get in the way of our learning how to move into this field. You have to give people a choice, an option —you can't ram this stuff down anybody's throat. People have to work up patterns of teaching and dealing with this area in their own good time and within a context that is comfortable for them.

We have a great deal of confidence that people do come along, especially when they begin to understand that there is a dichotomy in some people's mind between particularism and universalism. But there is also a dialectic between the two, and it is the dialectic, and the capacity to deal with the two seemingly very different forms of identification in a wholesome way, that will get you where you want to go.

You have to see that there is almost a life cycle problem here of developmental thought and expression of emotion about yourself and society. There is constant change in this field because we are maturing with all kinds of strong emotions about our identity at certain points in our lives. Research has demonstrated that people who are in their sixties differ in their remembrance and reminiscence and nostalgia from people in their forties. Things become more important as you go through the life cycle. Everybody knows that people seemingly become more conservative as they age —or at least more traditional. If we learn how to use these perceptions for education, we will do a much better job.

Russell L. Adams *(Moderator)*

Elizabeth, your turn.

Elizabeth Farquhar *(Panelist)*

I'd like to mention what I see as impediments —the focus of one of the subquestions.

I believe the present emphasis on basic skills, at a time when there is concern about the adequacy of resources, will create a real problem, an impediment, for any kind of social curriculum. When kids can't read and write, people are going to say that these are the skills we must emphasize, not the content which follows after one has learned them. There is no question about the seriousness of this problem. There really is no solution to it; you simply have to fight it constantly if you believe in what we are talking about.

Another problem is the evident fear that people have about our topic. I think to a great extent that fear arises because multicultural concerns touch on a personal, private realm. As Mr. Levine said, the teacher's feelings about his or her own ethnicity will influence how that teacher approaches teaching the subject in the classroom.

There have been some rather poorly conceived and executed programs in ethnic studies, some of them in recent years. Some have even created new ethnic stereotypes, of all things! Others have emphasized the quaint past rather than cultural change and the vitality of the ethnic force, now as in the past. I think that image of badly designed programs is a problem for the future of ethnic studies, to some extent.

On the other hand, there are some very good programs, and we have learned from experience. It seems to me that desegregation plans, some of which have involved multicultural programs, provide us with one positive example in this area.

The realization of global interdependence is another positive force, and people are beginning to become aware of and concerned about cultural factors in a global sense.

Increased immigration into this country is another impediment. If kids don't speak the language, we must develop programs to reach them.

We have talked of fear and the "newness" which frightens people, and I want to protest a little bit. We have made some real progress. There are a number of states, for example, which have requirements for ethnic studies. While there is a certain amount of healthy skepticism (and skepticism is a good idea) on the part of educators that this is a fad, there are federal dollars for it, so let's all get into it, at the same time there

are some state mandates requiring schools to take a look at what is happening in multicultural education. AATCE has sent a form bearing on accreditation of teacher education which asks teacher-training institutions to look at their multicultural offerings. Again, that is a positive, concrete factor. It means that there has to be some attention to multicultural education in the training of teachers, and I think we need to learn how to do it better, how to do it well.

As today's discussion has made clear, there is an interest now in the study of self. I think this is a real movement—evident in many places— that speaks positively for the continance of multicultural education.

Russell L. Adams *(Moderator)*

Let us have the last panelist on this point.

Michael Novak *(Panelist)*

It is obvious from the level of sophistication in this symposium that we are far ahead of where we were 10 years ago. If you go into a school library today, elementary or high school, or in the bookstore at the university, you will find shelves of books on the black experience in the United States which just didn't exist let's say 15 years ago; there are books on the Spanish-speaking or Spanish-surname tradition, on a variety of ethnic traditions —all relatively new. That's a big step forward and makes our job a lot easier.

I was going to make a few remarks about some practical steps to be taken in elementary school. We don't have good fairy tales, good creative literature, for young children which come out of the many cultures of the world. Most of the fairy tales are from Grimm, and so on, from only one part of the world. There are imaginative things that can be done and are being done in the world's languages. If you visit bookstores in other countries, you can find fairy-tale books which, translated into English, would have an immediate appeal to families in the United States.

With regard to high school, I think this is an important age for students to have multicultural work, to share different family experiences, to confront one another, to examine stereotypes, and so on —this is especially true in the Northeast and North Central states. You see ethnic interest in the movies, "Saturday Night Fever," "Rocky." Teenagers have strong ethnic feelings, but they don't have a safe place to talk these things through. They have quite confused assumptions about one another, and they need help in finding their way through

that thicket of emotion.

As for universities, our intellectual history about the rest of the world is deplorable. Even if you try your best, there are simply blank spots about many regions of the world.

So on every educational level there are things to be done.

I want to use the two or three minutes left to me on an underlying theme. The new ethnicity is free. It is to be freely chosen by the individual, and mustn't injure the student's, the parent's or the individual's right to choose. This freedom makes ethnicity an odd sort of phenomenon —you really are free to do with it what you want. Of course, you didn't choose your grandparents and in that sense you are not free —you can't become just anything. (You can fake it but that doesn't last long.) Nevertheless, you can spend as much or as little time in your ethnicity as you care to. That is a great thing about the United States, and we must not damage that. If there has been damage, I think it has been that there is no help if you want to pursue your roots, not that we have forced people into something they don't want.

Black studies over the last few years may be an exception to that. I know Orlando Patterson and Thomas Sowell, among others, have expressed the fear that, at least in certain locations, black students are dragooned into black-studies programs who don't want to be there. That can happen in any ethnic-studies program, and we must guard against it. We should be very clear that the new ethnicity is new because it is not tribal; it's free, it's chosen, it's self-conscious —and that's a new possibility in the modern world.

Ethnicity may be a mixed bag. If you are Slavic, you can get very tired of people being unable to pronounce your name. And then comes the Polack joke. It just drives you up a wall. People in many, many ethnic groups in America know that they have low status, are low on the ethnic totem pole. If you have 10 pictures of pretty women and keep changing the names under them while asking people to rank who is the prettiest, you see the ethnic totem pole pretty clearly. Each name change, and the ethnicity suggested by it, brings a different ranking. It is astonishing. Luigi Barzini described in *O America!* explained why he went back to Italy after living his early life here. He found the contempt in which Italian-Americans were held too strong for him; he didn't want to live out a career fighting against an inferiority complex. It is a touching book and there are many such.

So, people have mixed feelings about being identified as of this or that ethnicity. I, myself, don't want to be so identified in some settings. I know the reaction will be negative, and I just don't want to fight through all that. We have to respect this feeling. It is a complicated thing. It changes over time in the life of an individual. For some periods in your life your

ethnic heritage is the last thing you want someone to bring up; in another period it is something you are interested in and want to emphasize. There are also changes within the experience of an ethnic group. The Syrian-Lebanese in America went through a whole period of being Syrians, then Lebanese, then Arab, and now there is a great deal of insecurity about their identity. Almost every group has a pattern of change over generations.

It is important to try to learn the hidden languages of the souls of people, too. There are some Americans who will go to Esalen and pay $120 for a weekend to learn how to yell, scream, shout, show rage. If you are born Italian or Slovak or Jewish or Greek, you learn that free. Cultures differ in the emotions which they consider signs of strength and signs of weakness. In many cultures it is quite all right to get angry —a good Slav has an obligation to get angry three times a day! In 1972 they kept calling Ed Muskie "testy" —that's a code name for Polish; he just gets angry often, as he has an obligation to do. He is not supposed to keep his anger in, but letting it out hurts when you are running for President. He didn't keep his "cool."

The point is that many people in America have a language of their soul which they never see reflected in literature. One reason for studying literature in school is to hold a mirror up to yourself. Yet many of us went through school without ever seeing a mirror that reflected ourselves. I read no Slovak-American literature. Such as there was, was never put in my hands. I always thought that literature was about others, that I wanted to write literature, I would have to go live with others in order to find a proper literary subject.

There are many, many Americans, I would think a majority of Americans, who have no public language for the private language of the soul, which is shaped by what has happened in the family for a thousand years. I think that is why Alex Haley made so many millions cry, literally shed tears. He gave them a public language, a public set of symbols by which they could understand themselves. He liberated them from trying to make signals across the darkness which nobody could understand and even they themselves couldn't understand.

There are so many of us in America who have lacked that public language, although I realize that providing it is not entirely the function of the school. You need creative artists to do that. "Roots" could not have been written by a committee. A school board could never have produced it.

CLOSING COMMENTS

Russell L. Adams *(Moderator)*

We have reached three o'clock and in about two minutes I want to try to summarize what we have discussed in three hours.

The summary falls under what I call the three U's of the day. In the first part of our discussion we talked about the *ubiquity of pluralism*. We may not *know* how to define it, but we know it when we see it. It is everywhere.

In discussing the responsibility of the schools, we came upon the second U, our yearning for a *uniformity of awareness* about what these responsibilities might be. I think the organizers of this symposium hoped to create uniformity of awareness about the possible role that schools could play, being careful, too, to avoid potential regimentation and standardization in launching this idea.

Finally, the last U, shorthand for what I call the *uncollected*. There are many, many educational programs concerned with pluralism —curricular materials that await collection in one central place. We must think of ways in which these materials might be collected and pooled, to enlighten the unenlightened and encourage the fainthearted.

The underlying theme of our symposium has been, first, to raise our consciousness either in terms of reaffirmation or confirmation (or puzzlement) with regard to pluralism. Second, to explore the connections between the schools, citizen education, and cultural pluralism. Third, to determine what can—and should— be done by schools in this domain. If this gathering has only whetted your appetite for examining the possibilties, then our afternoon has been well spent.

Let me yield the floor to our leader, Russ Hill.

Russell A Hill *(Research for Better Schools)*

Thank you, Mr. Moderator. Thank you, panel. Thank you, guests. I hope you found this an interesting and stimulating event. The proceedings will be edited and published as soon as possible, and you will all receive the publication in due course. We hope also to move in the direction of the suggestions today. We will be in contact with you.

Appendix 1: Panelists and Participants

RUSSELL L. ADAMS
Howard University

WILTON ANDERSON
U.S. Office of Education

FRED BERGERSON
House Committe on Education and Labor

KAREN DAWSON
U.S. Office of Education

ELIZABETH FARQUHAR
U.S. Office of Education

ROSA CASTRO FEINBERG
General Assistance Center for Bilingual Education
University of Miami

LAWRENCE FLAKE
Church Educational System-Northeast U.S.A.
Church of the Latter Day Saints

JERRY FLETCHER
Department of Health, Education, and Welfare

JANET GILBERT
New York State Education Department

PERRY GILMORE
Research for Better Schools

ELLEN GRIFFIN
U.S. Office of Education

DAVID GURR
American Council to Improve Our Neighborhoods

JOHN HALE
National Endowment for the Humanities

BYRON W. HANSFORD
Council of Chief State School Officers

M. BRUCE HASLAM
National Institute of Education

RUSSELL A. HILL
Research for Better Schools

ELIZABETH L. JOHNS
Institute for Educational Leadership

JOSEPH KERNS
Teacher Corps

CAROL KIMMEL
Past President, National Congress of Parents and Teachers

BRIAN J. LARKIN
National Council for the Social Studies

IRVING LEVINE
American Jewish Committee

GEORGE E. LOWE
U.S. Office of Education

ANN MAUST
U.S. Office of Education

CHARLES MILLER
Office of Bilingual Education

OLIVER MOLES
National Institute of Education

RUDOLF J. MUNIS
Office of Bilingual Education

MICHAEL NOVAK
University of Syracuse
Author; Lecturer

FRED PFLUGER
House Appropriations Committee

BARBARA Z. PRESSEISEN
Research for Better Schools

ROOSEVELT RATLIFF
Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development

CARLEEN RECK
National Catholic Education Association

WADE ROBINSON
CEMREL, Inc.

CHARLENE ROTHKOPF
Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development

SYLVIA SPENSER
Office of Bilingual Education

JOAN D. WALLACE
Research for Better Schools

CHARLOTTE B. WARREN
Council for Educational Development and Research

BARBARA WELLS
Office of Bilingual Education

BLANCA WESTGATE
Office of Bilingual Education

MILDRED ZUCKER
The Edward W. Hazen Foundation

Appendix 2: Biographical Sketches of Panelists

Russell L. Adams is Associate Professor of Afro-American Studies and Chairman, Department of Afro-American Studies, Howard University. He received the Ph.D. degree in political science from the University of Chicago in 1971. Prior to his present position, Dr. Adams served as Research Director, American Negro Emancipation Centennial Authority, 1961-1963; Assistant Professor of Science, North Carolina Central University, 1965-67; Chairman, Department of Political Science, North Carolina Central University, 1967-69; and Acting Chairman, Division of Humanities, Federal City College, 1969-70. Dr. Adams is a consultant to several organizations, including the Montgomery County (Md.) schools and the Institute of Urban Research, Florida State University. He is a member of national commissions and task forces on Afro-American affairs and has written widely in this area as well as in political science. His book *Great Negroes Past and Present* (Afro-American Publishing Co., 1963), a standard of its genre, has been reprinted several times.

Elizabeth Farquhar is a specialist in planning and budgeting for international education programs and was a program officer for the Ethnic Heritage Studies Program in its initial years, both with the U.S. Office of Education (USOE). She holds a M.A. degree in history from American University and is currently a Ph.D. candidate at the University of Southern California, specializing in intercultural education. She serves as coordinator of the USOE Citizen Education Staff, which is preparing a report on citizenship education in the United States today, covering children and adults in both formal and nonformal educational settings. In addition to her citizen education assignment, Ms. Farquhar serves on several agency-wide task forces charged with responsibility for recommending policy initiatives to the Commissioner of Education. She has evaluated grants proposals for a number of federal programs and is a frequent contributor to meetings and committees concerned with the issues of citizen participation, community-school linkages, and multi-cultural education. Ms. Farquhar is a member of the Professional and Executive Corps, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

Rosa Castro Feinberg is Associate Director of the General Assistance Center for Bilingual Education, University of Miami. She received the M.S. degree in Curriculum and Supervision from Florida State University, and the Ph.D. degree in Educational Administration from Florida State University. Prior to her present position Dr. Feinberg served for two years as a bilingual consultant with the Florida School Desegregation Consulting Center, University of Miami. Her early professional experience included teaching, chiefly in Dade County (Fla.), in a number of related areas: bilingual education, English —second language, Spanish— foreign language, language arts, and speech. Among her special interests are education of the disadvantaged, multicultural education, and language education. Dr. Feinberg is the author of various articles on these and related areas.

Irving M. Levine is the Director, Institute on Pluralism and Group Identity, National Project on Ethnic America, American Jewish Committee. He received his bachelor's degree at New York University and did graduate work at both the New York University Center for Human Relations and the University of Wisconsin School of Social Work. Mr. Levine first entered professional service in the youth and community-center field —first in Brooklyn and later in Milwaukee, where he was appointed to the Wisconsin Governor's Youth Advisory Commission. He was also Queens Community Relations Field Consultant for the New York City Commission on Human Rights and Director of the Indiana and later the Ohio Conferences on Civil Rights Legislation. He joined the American Jewish Committee's New York staff in 1964, where his efforts led to his appointment as Chairman of the Citywide Committee for Educational Parks. The principal organizer and chairman of the 1968 National Consultation of Ethnic America, Mr. Levine also developed, and now heads, "The National Project on Ethnic America," which is largely supported by the Ford Foundation. A board member of many human-rights, community, and interfaith associations, Mr. Levine consults widely with government and private groups and is a frequent lecturer at universities. He is the author of many published professional papers, appears on his own radio show, and makes frequent television guest appearances.